

MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND  
PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS OF INTEGRATED  
GASIFICATION PROCESS AND PROTON  
EXCHANGE MEMBRANE FUEL CELL

MUHAMMAD BILAL BIN MUSLIM

MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG



## **SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION**

We hereby declare that We have checked this thesis and in our opinion, this thesis is adequate in terms of scope and quality for the award of the degree of Master of Science

---

(Supervisor's Signature)

Full Name : DR NOOR ASMA FAZLI BIN ABDUL SAMAD  
Position : SENIOR LECTURER  
Date : 21 JANUARY 2019

---

(Co-supervisor's Signature)

Full Name : DR SURIYATI BINTI SALEH  
Position : SENIOR LECTURER  
Date : 21 JANUARY 2019



## **STUDENT'S DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that the work in this thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at Universiti Malaysia Pahang or any other institutions.

---

(Student's Signature)

Full Name : MUHAMMAD BILAL BIN MUSLIM

ID Number : MKC15038

Date : 21 JANUARY 2019

MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS OF INTEGRATED  
GASIFICATION PROCESS AND PROTON EXCHANGE MEMBRANE FUEL  
CELL

MUHAMMAD BILAL BIN MUSLIM

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements  
for the award of the degree of  
Master of Science

Faculty of Chemical & Natural Resources Engineering  
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

JANUARY 2019

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank to ALLAH for giving me a chance to complete this thesis. Actually, I definitely did not expect that out of all chapters in this thesis, writing down this acknowledgement section is going to be the hardest of all. However, I would try my very best and for individuals that are inadvertently omitted, I would like to propose my apologies and thank you for everything. As often said, old age comes in hand not only with wisdoms but also forgetfulness.

Secondly, I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to Abah, Muslim Ahmad and Umi, Zalina Zainon. Both of you have been the backbone of my entire being, my emotional support for the past 26 years. I do honestly hope I have made both of you proud. For my siblings, Umairah, Aini Khalida and Fatihah, well what I can say, all of you have been my support of strength, someone that I know I can look up to and always be there for me during my up and down.

Well, where would I be in my studies without my two esteemed supervisors and co-supervisor, Dr Noor Asma Fazli Abdul Samad and Dr. Suriyati Saleh, Thank you foremost for giving me the opportunity of lifetime to do my Master's here and most importantly for the never-ending trust, dedications, and faith not only in my ability but also in me personally. I also want to thank to all lecturers in Faculty of Chemical & Natural Resources Engineering (FKKSA) that always giving me advice and supporting me directly or indirectly. My deepest gratitude also goes to all technical and administrative staffs that had assisted me in thousand ways I could ever possibly imagine. I am also very much indebted to Ministry of High Education (MOHE), for providing me with the scholarship (MYBRAINS) throughout my duration of study here.

Next, to my best friends, Fakhrul Razil Alawi, Zakirah and Hazirah, thank you for being there always for me. You three certainly seen the inferior of me but yet never fail to bring out the best in me. To Ameerul Hakeem, Abu and Syafiq, thank you all for the times we spend together. We certainly define the meaning of working hard and playing harder, but ultimately; no matter how terrible the world goes at times, it will be better eventually when you have friends around to cheer you up. To my best mates, well I am truly proud and honored to share this ride along with all of you. Thank you so much. For everyone, cheers, and meet all of you again in the future.

MUHAMMAD BILAL BIN MUSLIM

21 JANUARY 2019

DEDICATION TO MY FAMILY

ABAH, UMI, MERAH, IDA & TEHAH

## ABSTRAK

Ketika ini, jumlah permintaan tenaga dari seluruh dunia semakin meningkat selaras dengan pertumbuhan ekonomi. Kebanyakan sumber tenaga yang digunakan adalah berpunca daripada bahan api fosil yang merupakan sumber yang tidak boleh diperbaharui. Walaupun sumber bahan api fosil masih lagi banyak, permintaan tinggi terhadap sumber bahan api yang terhad ini tidak dapat dielakkan di mana sumber ini akan kehabisan kelak. Jadi, sumber tenaga yang boleh diperbaharui kini dilihat sebagai pilihan terbaik untuk menggantikan sumber bahan api fosil sebagai penjana utama tenaga. Sisa kelapa sawit merupakan salah satu alternatif untuk menggantikan bahan api fosil dimana sisa ini boleh digunapakai untuk penggunaan tenaga kerana jumlahnya yang banyak dan ketersediaannya di Malaysia. Sisa ini boleh digunakan untuk menghasilkan produk yang berguna seperti gas sintesis untuk penjaan tenaga. Oleh itu, integrasi kerangka kerja bagi sistem penggegasan dan sel bahan api berasaskan membran pertukaran proton (PEMFC) telah dibuat untuk menghasilkan gas sintesis yang diperlukan dan penjaan tenaga melalui langkah yang spesifik di dalam rangka kerja. Aplikasi rangka kerja ini diaplikasikan melalui lima kajian kes yang berbeza di mana setiap kes mempunyai objektif yang berlainan. Kesemua lima kajian kes meliputi pengesanan penggegas lapisan tetap dan penggegas lapisan terbendalir, perbandingan prestasi kedua-dua penggegas tersebut, penggegasan sisa kelapa sawit yang mentah dan telah ditorekfas, kesan penulenan hidrogen serta penghasilan kuasa. Kedua-dua model penggegas jenis lapisan tetap dan lapisan terbendalir telah dibuat menggunakan perisian Aspen Plus dan keputusan pengesanan yang didapati adalah bertepatan dengan data kajian yang telah dijalankan. Jumlah hidrogen yang tinggi didapati dalam penggegas lapisan terbendalir berbanding lapisan tetap menunjukkan penggegas lapisan terbendalir memberi prestasi yang lebih tinggi dalam menghasilkan gas sintesis. Pelbagai jenis sisa kelapa sawit seperti pelepah kelapa sawit, tandan kelapa sawit, tempurung kelapa sawit dan gentian mesokarpa sawit telah digunakan sebagai bahan suapan untuk kedua-dua penggegas dan keputusan simulasi menunjukkan pelepah kelapa sawit menghasilkan 7.81 % dan 5.12 % gas hidrogen untuk penggegas lapisan terbendalir dan lapisan tetap. Untuk komposisi gas sintesis, pelepah kelapa sawit yang ditorefaksi pada 300 °C menghasilkan gas hidrogen tertinggi berbanding pelepah kelapa sawit yang mentah menunjukkan torefaksi merupakan cara rawatan yang dapat menambahbaik penghasilan gas sintesis. Kesan penulenan juga telah diuji dan menunjukkan lebih banyak gas hidrogen telah terhasil dan jumlah gas karbon monoksida telah dikurangkan sehingga di bawah paras 10 ppm bagi memenuhi prasyarat untuk menggunakan sel bahan api berasaskan membran pertukaran proton (PEMFC). Bagi penghasilan kuasa, pelepah kelapa sawit yang ditorefaksi pada 300 °C menghasilkan kuasa yang paling tinggi iaitu 5.74 kW dan 6.65 kW untuk penggegas lapisan tetap-PEMFC dan penggegas lapisan terbendalir-PEMFC. Dari segi kecekapan pula, untuk penggegas lapisan terbendalir-PEMFC, pelepah kelapa sawit yang ditorefaksi pada 300 °C menghasilkan 55.88 % untuk kecekapan elektrik, 74.24 % untuk kecekapan keseluruhan dan 34.98 % untuk kecekapan tindan sel bahan api. Manakala untuk penggegas lapisan tetap-PEMFC, pelepah kelapa sawit yang ditorefaksi pada 300 °C menghasilkan 48.27 % untuk kecekapan elektrik, 69.47 % untuk kecekapan keseluruhan dan 27.74 % untuk kecekapan tindan sel bahan api. Kesimpulannya, integrasi kerangka kerja untuk penggegasan dan PEMFC boleh digunakan sebagai alat untuk penjaan tenaga dan penunjuk kecekapan manakala torefaksi sebagai cara rawatan boleh meningkatkan penghasilan gas hidrogen dan penjaan tenaga.

## ABSTRACT

The total energy demands from the entire global are increasing every day in order to support economic growth. Most of the sources of energy used are coming from fossil fuel which is non-renewable energy sources. Although there are still large supplies of fossil fuel, it is inevitable that one day the amount of fossil fuel will be decreased and running out. Hence, the renewable energy sources are currently identified as the best choice for replacing the fossil fuels as main energy supply. Palm oil wastes as the alternative for fossil fuel substitution have the potential to be utilized for energy purpose due to its abundances and availabilities in Malaysia. This biomass can be used to produce useful product such as synthesis gas which can be utilized for power production. Thus, an integrated workflow of biomass gasification and PEMFC has been developed for producing the required synthesis gas and power production. The applications of the integrated workflow are highlighted through five different case studies which each have different objectives. All five case studies are covering the model validation of fixed and fluidized bed gasifiers, performance of the gasifiers, gasification of raw and torrefied palm oil wastes, and effects of purification on the hydrogen and power production. Both models of fixed and fluidized bed gasifiers have been developed in Aspen Plus software and the validation results obtained are in good agreement with literature data. Higher amount of hydrogen gas was obtained in fluidized bed gasifier compare to fixed bed gasifier which indicates fluidized bed provides better performance for producing synthesis gas. Palm oil wastes such as Oil Palm Frond (OPF), Palm Kernel Shell (PKS), Palm Mesocarp Fiber (PMF) and Empty Fruit Bunch (EFB) have been used as inputs for both gasifiers and the simulation results show the OPF obtained 7.81 % and 5.12 % of hydrogen gas for fluidized bed and fixed bed gasifiers respectively. For synthesis gas composition, the torrefied OPF at 300 °C provides the highest hydrogen production compare to raw OPF indicating torrefaction as pre-treatment method is able to improve synthesis gas production. The effects of purification have been tested where more hydrogen gas are produced and the amount of carbon monoxide (CO) is reduced below 10 ppm which is the allowable amounts as input for Proton Exchange Membrane Fuel Cell (PEMFC). For power production, torrefied OPF at 300 °C provides the highest power produced around 5.74 kW and 6.65 kW for integrated fixed bed-PEMFC and fluidized bed-PEMFC respectively. In terms of efficiencies, for integrated fluidized bed-PEMFC, the torrefied OPF at 300 °C produces 55.88 % for electrical efficiency, 74.24 % for overall efficiency and 34.98 % for stack efficiency. Meanwhile for integrated fixed bed-PEMFC, the torrefied OPF at 300 °C produces 48.27 % for electrical efficiency, 69.47% for overall efficiency and 27.74 % for stack efficiency. In overall, the integrated gasification and PEMFC is able to be used as tools for power production and efficiency indicator and torrefaction as pre-treatment method is a useful for upgrading the hydrogen and power production.



## **TABLE OF CONTENT**

### **DECLARATION**

<b>TITLE PAGE</b>	<b>i</b>
-------------------	----------

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>ii</b>
-------------------------	-----------

<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>iv</b>
----------------	-----------

<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>v</b>
-----------------	----------

<b>TABLE OF CONTENT</b>	<b>vi</b>
-------------------------	-----------

<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>x</b>
-----------------------	----------

<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xi</b>
------------------------	-----------

<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	<b>xiv</b>
------------------------	------------

<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xv</b>
------------------------------	-----------

<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
-------------------------------	----------

1.1 Introduction	1
------------------	---

1.2 Problem Statement and Motivation	4
--------------------------------------	---

1.3 Objective	7
---------------	---

1.4 Scopes of Work	7
--------------------	---

1.5 Thesis Organization	8
-------------------------	---

<b>CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>9</b>
------------------------------------	----------

2.1 Biomass: The Definition	9
-----------------------------	---

2.2 Main Biomass Resources in Malaysia	9
--	---

2.3 Biomass Properties	10
------------------------	----

2.3.1 Proximate Analysis	11
--------------------------	----

2.3.2	Ultimate Analysis	12
2.3.3	Calorific Value	12
2.4	Biomass as a Fuel Sources	13
2.4.1	Combustion	13
2.4.2	Pyrolysis	14
2.4.3	Gasification	14
2.5	Biomass Torrefaction	16
2.6	Thermochemical Gasification of Biomass	16
2.6.1	Fixed-bed	17
2.6.2	Fluidized Bed	20
2.6.3	Entrained Flow	22
2.7	Fuel Cells	27
2.7.1	Alkaline Fuel Cells (AFC)	28
2.7.2	Phosphoric Acid Fuel Cells (PAFCs)	30
2.7.3	Molten Carbonate Fuel Cells (MCFCs)	32
2.7.4	Solid Oxide Fuel Cells (SOFCs)	33
2.7.5	Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) Fuel Cell	35
2.8	Hydrogen Purification	39
2.8.1	Purification with Hydrogen Selective Membrane	39
2.8.2	CO Methanation	40
2.8.3	Pressure Swing Adsorption	41
2.8.4	Preferential Oxidation of CO	41
2.9	Integrated Biomass Gasification and Fuel Cells	42
2.10	Research Gap	43
2.11	Concluding Remark	46

<b>CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>48</b>
3.1 Integrated Biomass Gasification and PEMFC Workflow	48
3.1.1 Problem Definition (Step 1)	48
3.1.2 Process and Product Specifications (Step 2)	49
3.1.3 Aspen Plus Modelling (Step 3)	52
3.1.4 Sensitivity Analysis (Step 4)	65
3.2 Concluding Remark	67
 <b>CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</b>	 <b>68</b>
4.1 Introduction	68
4.2 Case Study 1: Development of Fluidized Bed Gasification Model	68
4.2.1 Problem Definition (Step 1)	68
4.2.2 Process and Product Specifications (Step 2)	69
4.2.3 Gasification Modeling (Step 3(a))	69
4.3 Case Study 2: Development of Fixed Bed Gasification Model	75
4.3.1 Problem Definition (Step 1)	75
4.3.2 Process and Product Specifications (Step 2)	75
4.3.3 Gasification Modelling (Step 3(a))	76
4.4 Case Study 3: Performance Comparison Based On Different Gasifiers	81
4.4.1 Sensitivity Analysis (Step 4)	82
4.5 Case Study 4: Effects of Torrefaction on the H <sub>2</sub> Production in Biomass Gasification Process	92
4.5.1 Performance and Sensitivity Analysis (Step 5)	93
4.6 Case Study 5: Integration of Biomass Gasification Model and PEMFC for Power Production	108
4.6.1 Problem Definition (Step 1)	108

4.6.2	Process and Product Specifications (Step 2)	108
4.6.3	Gasification Modelling (Step 3 (a))	109
4.6.4	PEMFC Modeling (Step 3(b))	112
4.6.5	Integrated Biomass Gasification and PEMFC modeling (Step 3(c))	113
4.6.6	Sensitivity Analysis (Step 4)	113
4.7	Concluding Remark	118
<b>CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS</b>		<b>120</b>
5.1	Conclusions	120
5.2	Recommendation	122
<b>REFERENCES</b>		<b>123</b>
<b>APPENDIX A LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>		<b>134</b>
<b>APPENDIX B</b>		<b>136</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Comparison on the different types gasifier	24
Table 2.2	Previous literature regarding on fixed and fluidized bed gasification simulation based study	26
Table 2.3	Previous literature regarding on simulation based study on fuel cells	36
Table 2.4	Summary of major differences of the fuel cell types	38
Table 2.5	Previous literature regarding on fixed and fluidized bed gasification simulation based study	44
Table 3.1	Different unit blocks used for the gasification model	58
Table 3.2	The known variables used for PEMFC mathematical model	61
Table 3.3	Different unit blocks used for the gasification model	64
Table 3.4	Tested range for process variables	66
Table 4.1	Properties of beech chips	69
Table 4.2	Operating conditions for gasification process	72
Table 4.3	Performance comparison based on all range temperature of gasifier	75
Table 4.4	Properties of oil palm frond chips	75
Table 4.5	Operating conditions for gasification process	79
Table 4.6	Performance comparison based on all range temperature of downdraft fixed bed gasifier	81
Table 4.7	Ultimate and proximate analysis for palm oil wastes	82
Table 4.8	Ultimate and proximate analysis for all biomasses	93
Table 4.9	Percentages of output synthesis gas of gasifier and PROX	115
Table 4.10	Performance of the integrated gasification with PEMFC model	117

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Production of wastes from different industry in Malaysia	10
Figure 2.2	Thermochemical conversion and primary products	13
Figure 2.3	Types of gasification gasifier	17
Figure 2.4	Updraft fixed bed gasifier	18
Figure 2.5	Downdraft fixed bed gasifier	19
Figure 2.6	Bubbling fluidized bed gasifier	21
Figure 2.7	Circulating fluidized bed gasifier	22
Figure 2.8	Entrained flow gasifier	23
Figure 2.9	Schematic of a generic fuel cell	28
Figure 2.10	Schematic of a generic alkaline fuel cell	29
Figure 2.11	Schematic of a generic phosphoric acid fuel cell	31
Figure 2.12	Schematic of a generic molten carbonate fuel cell	32
Figure 2.13	Schematic of a solid oxide fuel cell	34
Figure 2.14	Schematic of a generic Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) fuel cell	35
Figure 2.15	Simplified concept schematic of membrane separation	40
Figure 2.16	Flow diagram of hydrogen purification by CO-PROX	42
Figure 2.17	Schematic diagram of the biomass gasification and PEMFC integrated system	43
Figure 3.1	An integrated workflow of gasification and PEMFC	49
Figure 3.2	Examples of proximate analysis in biomass database	50
Figure 3.3	Examples of ultimate analysis in biomass database	51
Figure 3.4	Sectional part of method specification in Aspen Plus	53
Figure 3.5	Sectional part of biomass definition in Aspen Plus	54
Figure 3.6	Sectional part of component attribute of proxanal in Aspen Plus	55
Figure 3.7	Sectional part of component attribute of ultanal in Aspen Plus	55
Figure 3.8	Sectional part of component attribute of sulfanal in Aspen Plus	56
Figure 3.9	Steady state of cell potential from previous study	62
Figure 4.1	Fluidized bed gasification process flowsheet	70
Figure 4.2	Fluidized bed gasification process flowchart	70
Figure 4.3	Comparison of carbon dioxide in fluidized bed reactor between simulation and predicted data	73
Figure 4.4	Comparison of carbon monoxide in fluidized bed reactor between simulation and predicted data	73

Figure 4.5	Comparison of methane in fluidized bed reactor between simulation and predicted data	74
Figure 4.6	Comparison of hydrogen in fluidized bed reactor between simulation and predicted data	74
Figure 4.7	Flowsheet of fixed bed gasification	76
Figure 4.8	Flowchart of fixed bed gasification	77
Figure 4.9	Comparison of carbon dioxide in fixed bed reactor between simulation and predicted data	79
Figure 4.10	Comparison of carbon monoxide in fixed bed reactor between simulation and predicted data	80
Figure 4.11	Comparison of methane in fixed bed reactor between simulation and predicted data	80
Figure 4.12	Comparison of hydrogen in fixed bed reactor between simulation and predicted data	81
Figure 4.13	Effects of gasification temperature on carbon dioxide production in fluidized and fixed bed gasifiers	83
Figure 4.14	Effects of gasification temperature on carbon monoxide production in fluidized and fixed bed gasifiers	83
Figure 4.15	Effects of gasification temperature on methane production in fluidized and fixed bed gasifiers	84
Figure 4.16	Effects of gasification temperature on hydrogen production in fluidized and fixed bed gasifiers	84
Figure 4.17	Effects of air to biomass ratio on carbon dioxide production in fluidized and fixed bed gasifiers	87
Figure 4.18	Effects of air to biomass ratio on carbon monoxide production in fluidized and fixed bed gasifiers	88
Figure 4.19	Effects of air to biomass ratio on methane production in fluidized and fixed bed gasifiers	88
Figure 4.20	Effects of air to biomass ratio on hydrogen production in fluidized and fixed bed gasifiers	89
Figure 4.21	Effects of steam to biomass ratio on carbon dioxide production in fluidized bed gasifier	90
Figure 4.22	Effects of steam to biomass ratio on carbon monoxide production in fluidized bed gasifier	91
Figure 4.23	Effects of steam to biomass ratio on methane production in fluidized bed gasifier	91
Figure 4.24	Effects of steam to biomass ratio on hydrogen production in fluidized bed gasifier	92
Figure 4.25	Effects of gasification temperature on carbon dioxide production using raw and torrefied OPF	94

Figure 4.26	Effects of gasification temperature on carbon monoxide production using raw and torrefied OPF	94
Figure 4.27	Effects of gasification temperature on methane production using raw and torrefied OPF	95
Figure 4.28	Effects of gasification temperature on hydrogen production using raw and torrefied OPF	95
Figure 4.29	Effects of air to biomass ratio on carbon dioxide production using raw and torrefied OPF	96
Figure 4.30	Effects of air to biomass ratio on carbon monoxide production using raw and torrefied OPF	97
Figure 4.31	Effects of air to biomass ratio on methane production using raw and torrefied OPF	97
Figure 4.32	Effects of air to biomass ratio on hydrogen production using raw and torrefied OPF	98
Figure 4.33	Effects of steam to biomass ratio on carbon dioxide production in fluidized bed gasifier	99
Figure 4.34	Effects of steam to biomass ratio on carbon monoxide production in fluidized bed gasifier	100
Figure 4.35	Effects of steam to biomass ratio on methane production in fluidized bed gasifier	100
Figure 4.36	Effects of steam to biomass ratio on hydrogen production in fluidized bed gasifier	101
Figure 4.37	Effects of gasification temperature on lower heating value in fluidized bed and fixed bed gasifiers	102
Figure 4.38	Effects of temperature on cold gas efficiency in fluidized bed and fixed bed gasifiers	103
Figure 4.39	Effects of air to biomass ratio on lower heating value in fluidized bed and fixed bed gasifiers	105
Figure 4.40	Effects of air to biomass ratio on cold gas efficiency in fluidized bed and fixed bed gasifiers	105
Figure 4.41	Effects of steam to biomass ratio on lower heating value in fluidized bed gasifier	107
Figure 4.42	Effect of steam to biomass ratio on cold gas efficiency in fluidized bed gasifier	108
Figure 4.43	Flowsheet of fluidized bed gasification with CO-PROX	110
Figure 4.44	Flowsheet of fixed bed gasification with CO-PROX	111
Figure 4.45	Comparison of cell potential between mathematical model and predicted data	112



## LIST OF SYMBOLS

$E_{\text{cell}}$	Cell voltage
$E_R$	Reversible cell potential
$\eta_a$	Activation loss at the anode
$\eta_c$	Activation loss at the cathode
$\eta_{\text{ohmic}}$	Ohmic loss (V)
$R$	Ideal gas constant ( $\text{Jmol}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}$ )
$T$	Operating temperature (K)
$\alpha$	Charge transfer coefficient
$F$	Faraday constant (C/mol)
$i$	Quantity of current density ( $\text{Acm}^{-2}$ )
$k_{\text{eh}}$	Rate constant of hydrogen electro-oxidation ( $\text{Acm}^{-2}$ )
$\theta_h$	Fractional surface coverage of hydrogen
$i_{\text{oc}}$	Cathode exchange current density ( $\text{Acm}^{-2}$ )
$n$	Number of cells used in PEMFC
$R_{\text{ohmic}}$	Ohmic resistance
$A$	Area of the active cell ( $\text{cm}^2$ )
$y_{\text{ie}}$	Experimental values
$y_{\text{ip}}$	Predicted values
$N$	Number of data points
$P_{\text{actual}}$	Exact value of the data
$P_{\text{measured}}$	Approximate value of the data
$V$	Cell voltage (V)
$\dot{m}_{\text{PG}}$	Mass flow of product gas (kg/h)
$\dot{m}_{\text{Bio}}$	Mass flow of biomass (kg/h)
$P_e$	Amount of power produce from the PEMFC
$P_h$	Amount of thermal energy from the PEMFC
$\eta_{\text{electrical}}$	Electrical efficiency
$\eta_{\text{thermal}}$	Thermal efficiency
$\eta_{\text{overall}}$	Overall efficiency
$\eta_{\text{stack}}$	Stack efficiency
$E$	electric energy input
$P_{\text{fc}}$	Output power produced by PEMFC (W)

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AMFCs	Alkaline Membrane Fuel Cells
ABR	Air to Biomass Ratio
AFC	Alkaline Fuel Cells
CGE	Cold Gas Efficiency
CO-PROX	Catalytic Preferential Oxidation of CO
DMFCs	Direct Methanol Fuel Cells
EFB	Empty Fruit Bunch
FC	Fixed Carbon
HHV	Higher Heating Value
HTS	High-Temperature Water Gas Shift Reactor
LHV	Lower Heating Value
LTS	Low-Temperature Water Gas Shift Reactor
MC	Moisture Content
MCFCs	Molten Carbonate Fuel Cells
OPF	Oil Palm Frond
PAFCs	Phosphoric Acid Fuel Cells
PEMFC	Proton Exchange Membrane Fuel Cell
PKS	Palm Kernel Shell
PMF	Palm Modocate Fibre
PR-BM	Peng Robinson with Boston-Mathias
PROXANAL	Proximate Analysis
RKS-BM	Redlich-Kwong-Soave with Boston-Mathias
RMSE	Root Mean Square Error
SBR	Steam to Biomass Ratio
SOFCs	Solid Oxide Fuel Cells
ULTANAL	Ultimate Analysis
VM	Volatile Matter

## REFERENCES

- Adams, D. (2013). *Sustainability of biomass for co-firing*.
- Aghamohammadi, N., Reginald, S. S., Shamiri, A., Zinatizadeh, A. A., Wong, L. P., and Sulaiman, N. M. B. N. (2016). An investigation of sustainable power generation from oil palm biomass: A case study in Sarawak. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 8(5), 1–19.
- Aly, M. R. (2013). Pelagia Research Library. *Der Chemica Sinica*, 4(4), 68–72.
- Apergis, N., and Danuletiu, D. C. (2014). Renewable energy and economic growth: Evidence from the sign of panel long-run causality. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 4(4), 578–587.
- Arena, U. (2012). Process and technological aspects of municipal solid waste gasification. A review. *Waste Management*, 32(4), 625–639.
- Arnavat, M. P. (2011). *Performance modelling and validation of biomass gasifiers for trigeneration plants*. Universitat Rovira I Virgili.
- Asafu-Adjaye, J., Byrne, D., and Alvarez, M. (2016). Economic growth, fossil fuel and non-fossil consumption: A pooled mean group analysis using proxies for capital. *Energy Economics*, 60, 345–356.
- Aspen Technology, I. (2004). *Getting Started Modeling Processes with Solids*. USA.
- Aspen Technology Inc. (2010). Thermodynamic property models. In *Aspen Physical Property System - Physical Property Models* (pp. 12–184). USA.
- Balan, C., Dey, D., Eker, S.-A., and Peter, M. (2004). Coal integrated gasification fuel cell system study final report. *Power*.
- Barelli, L., Bidini, G., Gallorini, F., and Servili, S. (2008). Hydrogen production through sorption-enhanced steam methane reforming and membrane technology: A review. *Energy*, 33(4), 554–570.
- Bartels, M., Lin, W., Nijenhuis, J., Kapteijn, F., and van Ommen, J. R. (2008). Agglomeration in fluidized beds at high temperatures: Mechanisms, detection and prevention. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 34(5), 633–666.
- Basu, P. (2013). *Combustion and gasification in fluidized beds* (Vol. 53). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Basualdo, M. S., Feroldi, D., and Outbib, R. (2012). PEM fuel cells with bio-ethanol processor systems: a multidisciplinary study of modelling, simulation, fault diagnosis and advanced control. *Green Energy and Technology*, 87.

- Batidzirai, B., Mignot, A. P. R., Schakel, W. B., Junginger, H. M., and Faaij, A. P. C. (2013). Biomass torrefaction technology: Techno-economic status and future prospects. *Energy*, 62, 196–214.
- Begum, S., Rasul, M. G., Akbar, D., and Ramzan, N. (2013). Performance analysis of an integrated fixed bed gasifier model for different biomass feedstocks. *Energies*, 6(12), 6508–6524.
- Bhatia, K. K., and Wang, C. Y. (2004). Transient carbon monoxide poisoning of a polymer electrolyte fuel cell operating on diluted hydrogen feed. *Electrochimica Acta*, 49(14), 2333–2341.
- Chen, W. H., Chen, C. J., Hung, C. I., Shen, C. H., and Hsu, H. W. (2013). A comparison of gasification phenomena among raw biomass, torrefied biomass and coal in an entrained-flow reactor. *Applied Energy*, 112, 421–430.
- Chui, E. H., Majeski, A. J., Lu, D. Y., Hughes, R., Gao, H., McCalden, D. J., and Anthony, E. J. (2009). Simulation of entrained flow coal gasification. *Energy Procedia*, 1(1), 503–509.
- Chutichai, B., and Arpornwichanop, A. (2015). Performance improvement of biomass gasification and PEMFC integrated system-design consideration for achieving high overall energy efficiency and power-to-heat ratio variation. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*, 43, 1501–1506.
- Chutichai, B., Authayanun, S., Assabumrungrat, S., and Arpornwichanop, A. (2013). Performance analysis of an integrated biomass gasification and PEMFC (proton exchange membrane fuel cell) system: Hydrogen and power generation. *Energy*, 55, 98–106.
- Demirbas, A. (2004). Combustion characteristics of different biomass fuels. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 30(2), 219–230.
- Doherty, W. (2014). *Modelling of Biomass Gasification Integrated with a Solid Oxide Fuel Cell System*.
- Dudynski, M., Van Dyk, J. C., Kwiatkowski, K., and Sosnowska, M. (2015). Biomass gasification: Influence of torrefaction on syngas production and tar formation. *Fuel Processing Technology*, 131, 203–212.
- Eden, M. R. (2012). *Introduction to ASPEN PLUS Simulation*.
- Eysenbach, G. (2008). Module 4: Fuel Cell Engine Technology. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 10(3), 22.
- Faaij, A. P. (2004). Biomass combustion. *Encyclopedia of Energy*, I: 175–191.

- Fantini, M. (2010). *Biorefineries. Green Energy and Technology* (Vol. 36).
- Fatoni, R., Gajjar, S., Gupta, S., Handa, S., and Elkamel, A. (2014). Modeling biomass gasification in a fluidized bed reactor. In *International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, 1047–1056.
- Fermeglia, M., Cudicio, A., Desimon, G., Longo, G., and Pricl, S. (2005). Process simulation for molten carbonate fuel cells. *Fuel Cells*, 5(1), 66–79.
- Fontes, B. E., Ab, C., Nilsson, E., and Generics, C. (2012). Modeling the fuel cell, 2–5.
- Fulton, L. (2004). *Reducing oil consumption in transport: Combining three approaches* (No. 1–24). Paris.
- Garcia, R., Pizarro, C., Lavin, A. G., and Bueno, J. L. (2013). Biomass proximate analysis using thermogravimetry. *Bioresource Technology*, 139: 1–4.
- George, J., Arun, P., and Muraleedharan, C. (2016). Stoichiometric equilibrium model based assessment of hydrogen generation through biomass gasification. *Procedia Technology*, 25, 982–989.
- Gimba, I. D., Abdulkareem, A. S., Jimoh, A., and Afolabi, A. S. (2015). Theoretical energy and exergy analyses of proton exchange membrane fuel cell by computer simulation. *Journal of Applied Chemistry*, 23, 123–128.
- Gomez-Barea, A., and Leckner, B. (2010). Modeling of biomass gasification in fluidized bed. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 36(4): 444–509.
- Gordillo, G., Annamalai, K., and Carlin, N. (2009). Adiabatic fixed-bed gasification of coal, dairy biomass, and feedlot biomass using an air-steam mixture as an oxidizing agent. *Renewable Energy*, 34(12), 2789–2797.
- Grashoff, B. G. J., Pilkington, C. E., and Corti, C. W. (1983). The purification of hydrogen, (4), 157–169.
- Gulzow, E. (1996). Alkaline fuel cells: A critical view. *Journal of Power Sources*, 61(1–2), 99–104.
- Gulzow, E., Schulze, M., and Steinhilber, G. (2002). Investigation of the degradation of different nickel anode types for alkaline fuel cells (AFCs). *Journal of Power Sources*, 106(1–2), 126–135.
- Haile, S. M. (2003). Fuel cell materials and components. *Acta Materialia*, 51(19): 5981–6000.
- Han, J., Liang, Y., Hu, J., Qin, L., Street, J., Lu, Y., and Yu, F. (2017). Modeling downdraft biomass gasification process by restricting chemical reaction equilibrium with Aspen Plus. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 153, 641–648.

- Hao, D., Shen, J., Hou, Y., Zhou, Y., and Wang, H. (2016). An improved empirical fuel cell polarization curve model based on review analysis. *International Journal of Chemical Engineering*.
- Holmes, M. (2010). Hydrogen separation membranes. *Technical Brief*, (May): 4.
- Hulteberg, P. C., Brandin, J. G. M., Silversand, F. A., and Lundberg, M. (2005). Preferential oxidation of carbon monoxide on mounted and unmounted noble-metal catalysts in hydrogen-rich streams. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 30(11), 1235–1242.
- IEA. 2017. Global Energy and CO2 Status Report (2017). *Global Energy and CO2 Status Report 2017*, (March).
- Inayat, A., Ahmad, M. ., Mutalib, M. I. ., Yusup, S., and Khan, Z. (2016). Parametric study on the heating values of product gas via steam gasification of palm waste using CaO as sorbent material, (December): 654–658.
- Ishida, H. (2013). Casual relationship between fossil fuel consumption and economic growth in Japan: A multivariate approach. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 3(2), 127–136.
- Jayathilake, R., and Rudra, S. (2017). Numerical and experimental investigation of equivalence ratio (ER) and feedstock particle size on birchwood gasification. *Energies*, 10(8), 1232.
- Jia, Z., Zhang, C., Cai, D., Blair, E., Qian, W., and Wei, F. (2017). The analysis of hot spots in large scale fluidized bed reactors. *RSC Advances*, 7(33), 20186–20191.
- Johansson, E. (2013). *Process integration study of biomass-to- methanol ( via gasification ) and methanol-to- olefins ( MTO ) processes in an existing steam cracker plant*. Chalmers University of Technology Abstract.
- Jones, J. M., Lea-Langton, A. R., Ma, L., Pourkashanian, M., and Williams, A. (2014). Pollutants generated by the combustion of solid biomass fuels (pp. 9–25). Springer.
- Kamarudin, S. K., Daud, W. R. W., Som, A. M., Mohammad, A. W., Takriff, S., and Masdar, M. S. (2004). The conceptual design of a PEMFC system via simulation. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 103(1–3), 99–113.
- Kaushal, P., and Tyagi, R. (2017). Advanced simulation of biomass gasification in a fluidized bed reactor using Aspen Plus. *Renewable Energy*, 101, 629–636.
- Khan, Z., Yusup, S., Ahmad, M. M., Chok, V. S., Uemura, Y., and Sabil, K. M. (2010). Review on hydrogen production technologies in Malaysia. *International Journal of*

- Engineering and Technology*, 10(02), 85–92.
- Kivisaari, T. (2001). *System studies of fuel cell power plants. Fuel Cell*.
- Kohnke, H., Sauer, G., Schudt, S., GmbH, G., Coyle, E., and Kennedy, D. (2005). Water and KOH transport in an alkaline fuel cell.
- Kumar, M. S., and Vivekanandan, S. (2014). Effect of design and operating parameters on the gasification process of biomass in a downdraft fixed bed: An experimental study. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 39(11): 5625–5633.
- Kuo, P. C., Wu, W., and Chen, W. H. (2014). Gasification performances of raw and torrefied biomass in a downdraft fixed bed gasifier using thermodynamic analysis. *Fuel*, 117, 1231–1241.
- Lawrence, D. L. (2010). *Purification of Hydrogen from a Thermo-chemical Process using a Single-Column Pressure Swing Adsorption System with Compound Written for presentation at the 2010 ASABE Annual International Meeting Sponsored by ASABE* (Vol. 0300). Pennsylvania.
- Lee, S. (2007). Gasification of Coal. In *Handbook of Alternative Fuel Technologies* (pp. 25–79). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Li, X. T., Grace, J. R., Lim, C. J., Watkinson, A. P., Chen, H. P., and Kim, J. R. (2004). Biomass gasification in a circulating fluidized bed. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 26(2), 171–193.
- Lima, D. F. B., Zanella, F. A., Lenzi, M. K., and Ndiaye, P. M. (2012). Modeling and simulation of water gas shift reactor: An industrial case. *Cdn.Intechopen.Com*.
- Mahat, A. S. (2012). *The palm oil industry from the perspective of sustainable development: a case study of Malaysian palm oil industry*. Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University Japan.
- Mahishi, M. R., and Goswami, D. Y. (2007). Thermodynamic optimization of biomass gasifier for hydrogen production. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 32(16), 3831–3840.
- Mahlia, T. M. I., Abdulmuin, M. Z., Alamsyah, T. M. I., and Mukhlishien, D. (2001). An alternative energy source from palm wastes industry for Malaysia and Indonesia, 42, 2109–2118.
- Malaysia Palm Oil Palm Statistics (2018). Monthly Oil Palm Products Processed : 2018 (                      Tonnes                      ).                      Retrieved                      from <http://bepi.mpob.gov.my/index.php/en/statistics/sectoral-status/190-sectoral-status-2018/863-oil-palm-products-processed-2018.html>

- McKendry, P. (2002). Energy production from biomass (part 3): Gasification technologies. *Bioresource Technology*, 83(1), 55–63.
- McPhail, S. J., Cigolotti, V., and Moreno, A. (2012). Fuel cells in the waste-to-energy chain. *Green Energy and Technology*, 45, 23–45.
- Mert, S. O., Ozcelik, Z., Ozcelik, Y., and Dincer, I. (2011). Multi-objective optimization of a vehicular PEM fuel cell system. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 31(13), 2171–2176.
- Mikko, K. (2011). *Biomass gasification*.
- Mikulandric, R., Bohning, D., Bohme, R., Helsen, L., Beckmann, M., and Loncar, D. (2016). Dynamic modelling of biomass gasification in a co-current fixed bed gasifier. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 125, 264–276.
- Milne, T. A., Elam, C. C., and Evans, R. J. (2002). *Hydrogen from biomass: State of the art and research challenges. International Energy Agency Agreement on the Production and Utilization of Hydrogen*. USA.
- Mirmoshtaghi, G. (2016). *Modeling and simulation bed gasifiers*. Malardalen University Press Dissertations.
- Mishra, A., and Prasad, R. (2011). A review on preferential oxidation of carbon monoxide in hydrogen rich gases. *Bulletin of Chemical Reaction Engineering & Catalysis*, 6(1), 1–14.
- Moka, V. K. (2012). *Estimation of calorific value of biomass from its elementary components by regression analysis*. National Institute Of Technology Rourkela.
- Moni, M. N. ., and Sulaiman, S. A. (2012). Downdraft gasification of oil palm fronds : Effects of temperature and operating time. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 24(12), 2574–2579.
- Moretti, E., Lenarda, M., Storaro, L., Talon, A., Frattini, R., Polizzi, S., and Jiménez-López, A. (2007). Catalytic purification of hydrogen streams by PROX on Cu supported on an organized mesoporous ceria-modified alumina. *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, 72(1–2), 149–156.
- MTI. (2007). *National energy policy report*. Singapore.
- Muslim, M. B., Saleh, S., and Samad, N. A. F. (2017). Effects of purification on the hydrogen production in biomass gasification process. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*, 56, 1495–1500.
- Muslim, M. B., Saleh, S., and Samad, N. A. F. (2017). Torrefied biomass gasification: A simulation study by using empty fruit bunch. *MATEC Web of Conferences*, 131.



- Muslim, M. B., Wahid, F. R. A. A., Saleh, S., and Samad, N. A. F. A. (2015). Application of integrated biomass gasification and proton exchange membrane fuel cell for power production. In *Proceeding of 28th Symposium of Malaysian Chemical Engineers* (pp. 1–10). Putrajaya.
- Nagel, F. P., Schildhauer, T. J., McCaughey, N., and Biollaz, S. M. A. (2009). Biomass-integrated gasification fuel cell systems - Part 2: Economic analysis. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 34(16), 6826–6844.
- Ni, M., Leung, D. Y. C., Leung, M. K. H., and Sumathy, K. (2006). An overview of hydrogen production from biomass. *Fuel Processing Technology*, 87(5): 461–472.
- Nikoo, M. B., and Mahinpey, N. (2008). Simulation of biomass gasification in fluidized bed reactor using Aspen Plus. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 32(12), 1245–1254.
- Niu, M., Huang, Y., Jin, B., and Wang, X. (2013). Simulation of syngas production from municipal solid waste gasification in a bubbling fluidized bed using Aspen Plus. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 52(42), 14768–14775.
- Ohta, T. (2009). Alkaline Fuel Cells. In *Energy Carriers And Conversion Systems With Emphasis On Hydrogen* (Vol. II, p. 320). EOLSS Publications.
- Ozturk, I. (2010). A literature survey on energy-growth nexus. *Energy Policy*, 38(1), 340–349.
- Paengjuntuek, W., Boonmak, J., and Mungkalasiri, J. (2015). *Energy Efficiency Analysis in an Integrated Biomass Gasification Fuel Cell System*. *Energy Procedia* (Vol. 79). Elsevier B.V.
- Pala, L. P. R., Wang, Q., Kolb, G., and Hessel, V. (2017). Steam gasification of biomass with subsequent syngas adjustment using shift reaction for syngas production: An Aspen Plus model. *Renewable Energy*, 101, 484–492.
- Park, E. D., Lee, D., and Lee, H. C. (2009). Recent progress in selective CO removal in a H<sub>2</sub>-rich stream. *Catalysis Today*, 139(4), 280–290.
- Perez, J. F., Benjumea, P. N., and Melgar, A. (2015). Sensitivity analysis of a biomass gasification model in fixed bed downdraft reactors: Effect of model and process parameters on reaction front. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 83, 403–421.
- Pourmovahed, A. (2005). Performance of a PEM fuel cell system. In *Proceedings of the 2005 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition*. Michigan: American Society for Engineering Education.
- Prins, M. J., Ptasiński, K. J., and Janssen, F. J. J. G. (2006). More efficient biomass gasification via torrefaction. *Energy*, 31(15), 3458–3470.

- Puig-Arnau, M., Bruno, J. C., and Coronas, A. (2010). Review and analysis of biomass gasification models. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 14(9), 2841–2851.
- Quaak, P., Knoef, H., and Stassen, H. (1999). Energy from biomass: A review of combustion and gasification technologies. *World Bank Technical Paper*, 422, 1–78.
- Quintana, N., Van Der Kooy, F., Van De Rhee, M. D., Voshol, G. P., and Verpoorte, R. (2011). Renewable energy from Cyanobacteria: Energy production optimization by metabolic pathway engineering. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 91(3), 471–490.
- Rabbani, R. A., and Rokni, M. (2012). Dynamic simulation of a proton exchange membrane fuel cell system for automotive applications. *Proceedings of SEEP2012*, 311–316.
- Ragland, K. W., Aerts, D. J., and Baker, A. J. (1991). Properties of wood for combustion analysis. *Bioresource Technology*, 37(2), 161–168.
- Rajashekara, K. (2000). Propulsion system strategies for fuel cell vehicles. *Sae Technical Paper Series*, (724).
- Remick, R., and Wheeler, D. (2010). *Molten carbonate and phosphoric acid stationary fuel cells: Overview and gap analysis molten carbonate and phosphoric acid stationary fuel cells: Overview and gap analysis*. National Renewable Energy Laboratory. USA.
- Rexed, I. (2014). *Applications for molten carbonate fuel cells*. KTH Royal Institute of Technology.
- Rupesh, S., Muraleedharan, C., and Arun, P. (2016). ASPEN plus modelling of air–steam gasification of biomass with sorbent enabled CO<sub>2</sub> capture. *Resource-Efficient Technologies*, 2(2), 94–103.
- Salami, N. (2012). *Gasification in Fluidized Bed : Effect of Using of the Air / Stream As Gasifying Agent on the Syngas Composition*. *Proceedings of the Conference on Energy from Biomass XIII*.
- Sardella, M. (2013). *Energy analysis of a fuel cell system for commercial greenhouse applications*. KTH School of Industrial Engineering and Management.
- Sarkar, J., and Bhattacharyya, S. (2012). Operating characteristics of transcritical CO<sub>2</sub> heat pump for simultaneous water cooling and heating. *Archives of Thermodynamics*, 33(4), 23–40.

- Sattler, G. (2000). Fuel cells going on-board. *Journal of Power Sources*, 86, 61–67.
- Schmidt, D. D., and Gunderson, J. R. (2000). Opportunities for hydrogen: An analysis of the application of biomass gasification to farming operations using microturbines and fuel cells. In *Proceedings of the 2000 Hydrogen Program Review* (pp. 1–12).
- Schonbrod, B., Marino, F., Baronetti, G., and Laborde, M. (2009). Catalytic performance of a copper-promoted CeO<sub>2</sub> catalyst in the CO oxidation: Influence of the operating variables and kinetic study. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 34(9), 4021–4028.
- Schudt, S., Kennedy, D., and Sauer, G. (2009). Engineering of a single alkaline fuel cell part II : Long-term operation in air. *Journal on Electrical Engineering*, 2(4).
- Schuster, G., Loffler, G., Weigl, K., and Hofbauer, H. (2001). Biomass steam gasification--an extensive parametric modeling study. *Bioresource Technology*, 77(1), 71–79.
- Shaari, N., and Kamarudin, S. K. (2015). Chitosan and alginate types of bio-membrane in fuel cell application: An overview. *Journal of Power Sources*, 289, 71–80.
- Shahbaz, M., Yusup, S., Inayat, A., Patrick, D. O., Partama, A., Inayat, A., and Fadzil, A. (2016). Thermal Investigation of Palm Kernel Shell ( PKS ) with Coal Bottom Ash in Thermo Gravimetric Analyser ( TGA ) in Inert Atmosphere, 5(1), 1–5.
- Shaohua, L., Deyong, C., Wenguang, Y., and Haigang, W. (2012). The effect of ER on biomass gasification in a fixed bed using Aspen Plus simulation. *World Automation Congress 2012*, 1–4.
- Sharaf, O. Z., and Orhan, M. F. (2014). An overview of fuel cell technology: Fundamentals and applications. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 32, 810–853.
- Sheth, P. N., and Babu, B. V. (2009). Experimental studies on producer gas generation from wood waste in a downdraft biomass gasifier. *Bioresource Technology*, 100(12), 3127–3133.
- Shuit, S. H., Tan, K. T., Lee, K. T., and Kamaruddin, A. H. (2009). Oil palm biomass as a sustainable energy source: A Malaysian case study. *Energy*, 34(9), 1225–1235.
- Siedlecki, M., de Jong, W., and Verkooijen, A. H. M. (2011). Fluidized bed gasification as a mature and reliable technology for the production of bio-syngas and applied in the production of liquid transportation fuels-a review. *Energies*, 4(3), 389–434.
- Sikarwar, V. S., Zhao, M., Clough, P., Yao, J., Zhong, X., Memon, M. Z., and Fennell,

- P. S. (2016). An overview of advances in biomass gasification. *Energy & Environmental Science*, 9(10), 2939–2977.
- Singhal, S. (2000). Advances in solid oxide fuel cell technology. *Solid State Ionics*, 135(1), 305–313.
- Singhal, S. C. (2007). Solid oxide fuel cells. *The Electrochemical Society Interface*, 41–44.
- Sordi, A., Lopes, D. G., and Neto, A. J. M. (2017). *Biomass gasification and fuel cell integration : The potential and efficiency*.
- Steward, D., Penev, M., and Saur, G. (2010). Fuel cell power model startup guide system designs and case studies modeling electricity heat and hydrogen generation (November).
- Susastriawan, A. A. P., Saptoadi, H., and Purnomo (2017). Small-scale downdraft gasifiers for biomass gasification: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 76, 989–1003.
- Suwatthikul, A., Limprachaya, S., Kittisupakorn, P., and Mujtaba, I. M. (2017). Simulation of steam gasification in a fluidized bed reactor with energy self-sufficient condition. *Energies*, 10(3), 1–15.
- Tagliabue, M., Farrusseng, D., Valencia, S., Aguado, S., Ravon, U., Rizzo, C., and Mirodatos, C. (2009). Natural gas treating by selective adsorption: Material science and chemical engineering interplay. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 155(3): 553–566.
- Takenaka, S., Shimizu, T., and Otsuka, K. (2004). Complete removal of carbon monoxide in hydrogen-rich gas stream through methanation over supported metal catalysts. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 29(10), 1065–1073.
- Takizawa, K. (1988). *Molden Carbonate Fuel Cells* (Vol. II).
- Tapasvi, D., Kempegowda, R. S., Tran, K. Q., Skreiberg, O., and Gronli, M. (2015). A simulation study on the torrefied biomass gasification. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 90, 446–457.
- Tasma, D., Uzunanu, K., and Panait, T. (2007). The effect of excess air ratio on syngas produced by gasification of agricultural residues briquettes. *Carbon*, 29, 22–60.
- Tripathy, R. (2013). *Production of Hydrogen Gas From Biomass Wastes Using Fluidized Bed Gasifier*. National Institute of Technology Rourkela-769008.
- U.S. Department of Energy (2011). Comparison of fuel cell technologies. *Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy*, (February): 3463.

- Varela-Gandia, F. J., Berenguer-Murcia, A., Lozano-Castello, D., and Cazorla-Amoros, D. (2010). Hydrogen purification for PEM fuel cells using membranes prepared by ion-exchange of Na-LTA/carbon membranes. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 351(1–2), 123–130.
- Veerasamy, R., Rajak, H., Jain, A., Sivadasan, S., Varghese, C. P., and Agrawal, R. K. (2011). Validation of QSAR Models - Strategies and Importance. *International Journal of Drug Design and Disoccovery*, 2(3), 511–519.
- Wahid, F. R. A. A., Harun, N. H. H. M., Rashid, S. R. M., Samad, N. A. F. A., and Saleh, S. (2017). Physicochemical property changes and volatile analysis for torrefactionn of oil palm frond. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*, 56, 199–204.
- Wahid, F. R. A. A., Muslim, M. B., Saleh, S., and Abdul Samad, N. A. F. (2016). Integrated gasification and fuel cell framework: Biomass gasification case study. *ARPJ Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 11(4), 2673–2680.
- Warnecke, R. (2000). Gasification of biomass: Comparison of fixed bed and fluidized bed gasifier. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 18(6), 489–497.
- WOC. (2016). *World Energy Resources Bioenergy 2016*.
- Xue, X. D., Cheng, K. W. E., and Sutanto, D. (2006). Unified mathematical modelling of steady-state and dynamic voltage-current characteristics for PEM fuel cells. *Electrochimica Acta*, 52(3), 1135–1144.
- Yan, Q., Toghiani, H., and Causey, H. (2006). Steady state and dynamic performance of proton exchange membrane fuel cells (PEMFCs) under various operating conditions and load changes. *Journal of Power Sources*, 161(1), 492–502.
- Yang, W., Ponzio, A., Lucas, C., and Blasiak, W. (2006). Performance analysis of a fixed-bed biomass gasifier using high-temperature air. *Fuel Processing Technology*, 87(3), 235–245.
- Yu, H., Chen, G., Xu, Y., and Chen, D. (2016). Experimental study on the gasification characteristics of biomass with CO<sub>2</sub>/air in an entrained-flow gasifier. *BioResources*, 11(3), 6085–6096.
- Yunus, M. K., Ahmad, M. ., Inayat, A., and Yusup, S. (2010). Simulation of enhanced biomass gasification for hydrogen production using iCON. *World Academy of Science*, 4(2), 753–760.
- Zhu, W. Z., and Deevi, S. C. (2003). A review on the status of anode materials for solid oxide fuel cells. *Materials Science and Engineering A*, 362(1–2), 228–239.